

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 809

IR 050 466

AUTHOR Fikes, Robert, Jr.; And Others
TITLE Trends in Faculty Status for Librarians, with Special
Emphasis on Academic Libraries in California.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 14p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Employment Qualifications;
Higher Education; Leaves of Absence; *Librarians;
Professional Continuing Education; *Professional
Development; Promotion (Occupational); Research;
Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Faculty Status; San Diego State
University CA

ABSTRACT

This paper briefly discusses trends since the mid-1960's and the situation as of 1981 with regard to faculty status for academic librarians, particularly in California. Issues mentioned include working the academic as opposed to the calendar year, promotion, job qualifications, tenure, sabbatical leaves, research requirements, writing for publication, and continuing education. Following a review of the literature concerned with faculty status in academic libraries, a description is provided of progress made in this direction at San Diego State University since 1966. Subsequent sections review faculty status in academic libraries in the California State University (CSU) and Colleges system, in California's junior colleges and private colleges and universities (particularly the University of the Pacific in Stockton), and in the University of California (UC) system. It is concluded that progress toward faculty status is continuing and that this progress is not likely to dissipate in the foreseeable future, especially in California. (ESR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED235809

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

IR

Trends in Faculty Status for Librarians, With Special
Emphasis on Academic Libraries in California

by

Robert Fikes, Jr., Katalin Harkanyi, and Gerald Johns
San Diego State University

IR050466

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Katalin Harkanyi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Nationally, the status of academic librarians in relationship to that of the teaching faculty strongly suggests that some current trends will continue into the foreseeable future. For at least the past decade, we have observed rising standards for librarians seeking employment in academic libraries. Generally, they are expected to have some acquaintance with automation, management skills, research and writing skills, and, hopefully, some prior on-the-job experience. Oftentimes a second master's degree is preferred or required. Once on the job they will be expected to demonstrate professional growth in areas similar to those of their counterparts in the teaching faculty. Such ongoing professional growth is viewed at most institutions as required in order to achieve tenure and promotion. The literature indicates that higher standards of performance for librarians will prevail in light of the tight, stubborn job market and competition for positions.

The demand for faculty status by academic librarians will probably continue so long as substantial disparities exist between them and the teaching faculty, especially as more well trained, ambitious librarians enter the profession. Moreover, as some studies have shown, the majority of teaching faculty may not be hostile to librarians' attempts to gain equivalent benefits when they have been willing to meet equivalent professional standards for tenure and promotion.¹

Some studies have concluded that there is little qualitative difference in the situation of librarians employed at colleges and universities where they have faculty status and institutions where they

do not.² However, on those campuses where librarians have faculty status there is a greater likelihood that they will work the academic year as opposed to the calendar year. For those librarians working the academic year, according to one study which interpreted data from a national survey, "all the other prerequisites usually follow," e.g., comparable salary, tenure, sabbaticals and research leaves, representation in faculty government, faculty title and rank, promotion based on merit, etc.³ The desire for the academic year is high on the list of librarians who see an opportunity to improve their position relative to that of the teaching faculty.

Two final points should be made here. First, the "publish or perish" syndrome is not likely to be introduced to libraries whose professional staff does not already have faculty status.⁴ But at those institutions where librarians do have faculty status, librarians will continue to be handicapped to some degree by lack of the kind of support normally given teaching faculty unless they commit themselves to fight for it. They must fight (or bargain) for such things as paid sabbaticals and release time arrangements, adequate funding, and policies that will enhance opportunities to do research and writing. Secondly, as David G. E. Sparks observed not long ago in College & Research Libraries, improved administration of academic libraries and the trend toward participative management should have the effect among librarians of encouraging "collegial governance and a (future) recognition of their role in the academy."⁵

Librarians employed in institutions of higher learning in the state of California are clearly affected by national trends, particularly in terms of progress toward faculty status and all that this implies. The

general situation of librarians employed in public colleges and universities here in the nation's most populous state with the largest number of academic libraries must be viewed as something more than a microcosm of what is occurring across the nation.

The following report surveys trends in respect to faculty status among academic librarians in California since the mid-1960's. In examining the specific case of San Diego State University's Malcolm A. Love Library and then the situation in the state university system, the junior colleges, and the University of California system libraries, it is hoped that a reasonably accurate and representative picture will emerge.

San Diego State University: A Short Review

In May 1966, a committee composed of librarians produced the library's personnel manual which outlined requirements and procedures regarding retention, tenure, and promotion. In 1967, the Director of Library Services agreed to the creation of a library faculty personnel committee for the evaluation of professional colleagues. April 1967 witnessed the promotion of the first non-supervisory librarians. The year 1973 marked a watershed for not only San Diego State University but for the entire California State University and Colleges system as explained by the Executive Secretary of the United Professors of California who, in analyzing a new plan defining working conditions (FSA 73-25), wrote:

. . . librarians were willing to agree to higher educational and experience requirements for hiring and promotion (roughly equivalent to teaching faculty) in return for the same salaries received by teaching faculty, sabbatical and research leaves with pay, fringe benefits equal to other faculty, and academic

year appointments. In short they wanted full academic status.

But, rather than a quid pro quo, standards' package imposes the new higher requirements for hiring and promotion with nothing in return, [Chancellor] Dumke got everything he wanted and the librarians got added responsibilities, stiffer requirements for advancement, the promise of less desirable staffing ratios, and, as a throwaway, the 4C workweek.⁶

The conditions imposed upon librarians by the new plan were questioned throughout the year with responses from the Chancellor's Office. "Why were changes in titles and workweek designations made?" "These two changes were supported strongly by the Librarians Personnel Study Committee as part of the total thrust toward more similarity of librarians to faculty."⁷ In June one high level administrator in the Chancellor's Office compared the librarians' upgrading of themselves to state university and college students who were getting degrees while working full time,⁸ and, in July, answering a letter from a librarian at California State College, Stanislaus, wrote: "It is time for librarians to devote themselves to their part of the bargain rather than to welsh on what they must do to enhance their status or even to justify what has already been done for them."⁹

A workshop session on the librarian personnel plan (FSA 73-25) was held in Malcolm A. Love Library during March 1977 emphasizing that professional advancement meant more publication and continuing education.¹⁰ In April 1979 it was announced to the Council of Library Department Chairmen that the new librarian personnel plan (FSA 78-64) did not supersede the previous one, and that old criteria should be included in the new plan.¹¹ Also in April 1979 a librarian was promoted for the first time after having been considered by the University Promotions Committee.¹²

As of July 1982, librarians at San Diego State University work a

controlled forty hour week in a twelve month academic year with no access to sabbatical or research leaves. Their route to retention, tenure, and promotion is the same as that for the faculty. They must be given recommendations from department chairs, departmental and/or personnel committees, deans (University Librarian), and university committees with emphasis at all levels on research, publication, involvement in professional organizations, and in service to the university and beyond.

Trends in the State University System

From all accounts, librarians in the California State University and Colleges system were exposed to and are being exposed to the same tortuous and vexatious meeting of requirements for retention, tenure, and promotion as librarians at San Diego State University; at the present time most of them follow procedures similar to those here. At CSU-Fresno, librarians participate in the same retention and tenure proceedings as the faculty with peer review at all levels. At CSU-Hayward, the Library Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee makes its recommendation; the University Librarian makes a separate recommendation; and both recommendations are sent to the president with emphasis on achievement in academic assignment, professional achievement, internal university service and external representation.¹³

The Reappointment and Advancement Committee at CSU-Long Beach sends its recommendations through the University Librarian to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The criteria are the same as those for the instructional faculty.¹⁴

The problems for all librarians in the California State University

system are neatly summed up by Helene Whitsun and Jeff Paul in their study of librarianship in an academic setting. Teaching faculty work a nine month year with a flexible workweek and with access to sabbatical and research leaves; librarians work an eleven month year with a controlled workweek and with no sabbatical or research leaves. Both have similar, if not identical, retention, tenure, and promotion requirements. (It also must be remembered that "teaching faculty" is an artificial designation; librarians also teach.) There are other differences, but the "parallels are not clearly delineated."¹⁵

The Junior Colleges

Junior college librarians are considered to be faculty and, together with their teaching colleagues, have the rank of instructor. Strictly speaking they do not have promotion. Raise in salary depends on continuous education. Taking a required number of courses automatically results in salary increase.

Private Colleges and Universities

Each of the private institutions has its own, perhaps unique system of RTP procedures. The University of the Pacific in Stockton, California was selected for closer examination. Since librarians here are considered faculty, The Operations Manual and Handbook for Academic Personnel also applies to them.

It is recognized at the University that the quality of education depends mostly on the faculty. Faculty members are regularly evaluated and those who demonstrate superior performance are considered for promotion. The evaluation is based on teaching effectiveness and contribution

to their individual schools and colleges. The diversity of programs mandate faculty role differentiation; thus, "no single set of criteria nor ranking of criteria . . . may apply to all faculty."¹⁶

For retention, and eventually for tenure, a candidate must meet minimum requirements in length of time served and education. Instructors must have the MLS and can stay at this rank for 3 years. Assistant professors must have two years of graduate preparation beyond the MLS; associate professors are required to have a second master's or doctorate; and professors, in addition to the preceding, must show evidence of maturity and superior intellectual and professional growth.

To achieve tenure the candidate must have the rank of assistant professor or above, the terminal degree or equivalent qualifications. The probationary period is at least seven full-time years.

Promotion is based upon the candidate's professional growth in the library and his/her contribution to the intellectual community and the library profession. Librarianship is attributed 50 points, broken into 5 parts each worth 10 points, covering such areas as professional competence, work habits, enthusiasm, innovation and imagination, rapport with clients, and willingness to accept criticism, even from students. Professional growth is assigned 25 points: 10 points for scholarly achievement and creative work; 5 points for contribution to professional and learned organizations; and 5 points for keeping up with current professional literature. Finally, university responsibility merits 25 points: 10 points for participating in departmental affairs and 15 points for committee work. With each requirement the acceptance of equivalency is emphasized but not defined. Librarians at the University of the Pacific are in the process of revising the above procedures and

standards.

University of California System

On 1 February 1969, the UCLA Librarians Association sponsored a conference on goals for librarians. Many interesting and some unique ideas were discussed at this conference. One librarian stated in her paper: "It would be a false goal if librarians tied themselves too closely to matching their education, scholarship, appointment and promotional procedures, etc. with similar faculty standards in order to achieve the salaries and status they desire."¹⁷ She advanced her thought one step further and pointed out that each group plays a distinct role in the process of education that should be recognized as equally valid.

A few of the other significant ideas were that (1) librarians are information managers and, consequently, they can be only second best as subject specialists. (2) Librarians' research should be conducted in management and for the reason of developing new techniques which improve services. This type of research is appropriate and not research for the sake of research. (3) Continuous education is important for librarians, but it should be in the area of librarianship for the purpose of improving service to the academic community.

A study of UC systems standard documents Appointment and promotion: Librarian series APM-360 and Review and appraisal committees APM-210 was conducted. According to these system-wide documents, librarians must be reviewed periodically in accordance with length of service to determine if merit increase or promotion is warranted (length of service at each salary level is clearly defined). In case a librarian did not

receive a merit increase or promotion for four years and is not at the top step of his/her rank, a committee is automatically formed to study the case.

Criteria for promotion is based on professional competence and quality of service, professional activity outside the library, university and public service, and research and other activities. Candidates are judged mostly by the first criteria. The others are considered if they are relevant. Reasonable flexibility in weighing the criteria has to be exercised according to the rules. Superior professional ability and achievement, professional growth and accomplishment or greater responsibility are also required for the ranks of Associate Librarian and Librarian.

In regard to professional competence and quality of service, candidates are evaluated in any or all areas of librarianship, e.g., selection, bibliographic control, reference service, application of special information services, and library administration. Consistency of performance, grasp of library methods, subject knowledge, and leadership are judged.

In respect to research and other creative activity, evaluation is qualitative. Reports, handbooks, manuals are only considered here if they present new ideas or incorporate research.

The often discussed CSUC (California State University and Colleges) system-wide document, FSA 73-25, obviously had its impact on professional standards applied to UC librarians, too. In contrast to the conference in 1969, Millicent D. Abell, Director of UC-San Diego Libraries, recently discussed the changing role of the academic librarian. According to Ms. Abell, the academic librarian's status depends on certain

environmental factors, hence library administrators should "relate the elements of a given librarian's status to parallel elements for the faculty in the same institution."¹⁸ As a result, in addition to meeting UC standards, UCSD librarians need to be active in local, state and national organizations to attain Associate and Librarian ranks. At UC-Irvine and UC-Riverside the second master's degree is emphasized, and at UC-Santa Barbara publications are the means to promotion. In summary, professional advancement for librarians now more closely resembles those standards set for teaching faculty.

Progress towards faculty status for academic librarians has been slow though steadily gaining ground in all three systems of public higher education, and in private colleges and universities as well. As noted at the beginning of this report, the trend toward faculty status, particularly in California, is one that will likely continue into the foreseeable future. The increasing demand by teaching faculty and students for more competence and efficient service and the demand by more highly skilled and educated librarians to be treated as professionals the same or nearly the same as teaching faculty will not suddenly dissipate.

Notes

¹M. Kathy Cook, "Rank, Status, and Contribution of Academic Librarians as Perceived by the Teaching Faculty at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale," College & Research Libraries 42 (May 1981), 214, 221.

²Among others, see: Russ Davidson, et al, "Faculty Status for Librarians in the Rocky Mountain Region: A Review and Analysis," College & Research Libraries 42 (May 1981), 203-213; Greg Byerly, "The Faculty Status of Academic Librarians in Ohio," College & Research Libraries 41 (September 1980), 422-429; and Stella Bentely, "Collective Bargaining and Faculty Status," Journal of Academic Librarianship 4 (May 1978), 75-81.

³J. Carlye Parker, "Faculty Status and the Academic Work Year," California Librarian 33 (April 1972), 143.

⁴Ronald Rayman and Frank Wm. Goudy, "Research and Publication Requirements in University Libraries," College & Research Libraries 41 (January 1980), 43-48.

⁵David G. E. Sparks, "Academic Librarianship: Professional Strivings and Political Realities," College & Research Libraries (September 1980), 419.

⁶United Professors of California, Memorandum (April 10, 1973).

⁷California State University and Colleges. Office of the Chancellor, Librarian Personnel Plan, FSA 73-67, Supplement #3 (May 2, 1973).

⁸California State University and Colleges. Office of the Chancellor, Librarians, FSA 73-67 (June 29, 1973).

⁹Letter to John Caldwell, Technical Services Librarian, California State College, Stanislaus (July 30, 1973).

¹⁰San Diego State University Library, Workshop Session on Librarian Personnel Plan, FSA 73-25 (March 14, 1977).

¹¹San Diego State University Library. Council of Department Chairmen, Minutes (April 19, 1979).

¹²San Diego State University. Office of the Director of Library Services, Library Information Circular (June 18, 1979).

¹³State University and College Librarians Chapter, Newsletter (August/September 1981).

¹⁴State University and College Librarians Chapter, Newsletter (October/November 1981).

¹⁵Helene Whitsun and Jeff Paul, "Librarianship in the Academic Setting: A Guide for Academic Administrators and Our Teaching Colleagues," State University and College Librarians Newsletter (November/December 1979).

¹⁶University of the Pacific, The Operations Manual and Handbook for Academic Personnel (Stockton, California: The University Press, 1978), 4: 4.1.

¹⁷Johanna E. Tallman, "Salary Position Paper," in Goals for UCLA Librarians, edited by Marcia Endore (Los Angeles: UCLA Librarian Association, 1969), p. 5.

¹⁸Millicent D. Abell, "The Changing Role of the Academic Librarian: Drift and Mastery," College & Research Libraries 40 (March 1979), 154-164.